



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,565	07/30/2003	Min-Ho Seo	P24001	6472
7055	7590	02/21/2007	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			SCHLIE, PAUL W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2186		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/21/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/629,565	SEO ET AL.
	Examiner Paul W. Schlie	Art Unit 2186

All Participants:

(1) Paul W. Schlie (USPTO).

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 7 February 2007

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*all*

Prior art documents discussed:

*see below*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: reviewed post allowance submitted IDS references, and agreed that although a multi-media device as disclosed is well known in general, no evidence of such a device utilizing a remote storage device of sufficient capacity to credibly store multi-media data whose power is conditionally sourced from said multi-media device yet accessed wirelessly was known of by either; and thereby considered non-obvious in its specific claimed combination..